REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed February 21, 2006. Claims 1-27 are rejected.

In this Amendment, claims 1, 7, 13, 19, and 26 have been amended. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment does not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Brown, et al. (USPN 6,747,995, "Brown") in view of Watts et al, (USPN 5,881,135, "Watts").

Claims 1-6

Applicants respectfully submit that Brown and Watts, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 1. In particular, Brown and Watts, either individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest "determining whether a digital signal processor needs a service program stored in an overlay memory, wherein the overlay memory stores a plurality of service programs associated with voice communication, fax communication, modem communication, video communication, and audio communication," as recited in amended claim 1.

Brown discloses adding voice lines over a single two-wire subscriber loop. (Brown, Abstract). Brown discloses processing voice data only. (Brown, col. 8, lines 9-

11). Watts discloses a common program memory that holds multiple control programs for different speech based services, such as speech recognition, speaker recognition, speaker verification, and speech synthesis. (Watts, col. 45, lines 51-52; col. 2, lines 6-8).

Neither Brown nor Watts teaches or suggests that an overlay memory stores a plurality of service programs associated with voice communication, fax communication, modem communication, video communication, and audio communication, as recited in amended claim 1.

As neither Brown nor Watts teaches or suggests each and every limitation of amended claim 1, the combination does not render obvious claim 1 and associated dependent claims 2-6, and 26-27.

Claims 7-12

As discussed, neither Brown nor Watts teaches or suggests that an overlay memory stores a plurality of service programs associated with voice communication, fax communication, modem communication, video communication, and audio communication, as recited in amended claim 7. Therefore, the combination does not render obvious claim 7 and associated dependent claims 8-12.

Claims 13-18

As discussed, neither Brown nor Watts teaches or suggests that an overlay memory stores a plurality of service programs associated with voice communication, fax communication, modem communication, video communication, and audio

communication, as recited in amended claim 13. Therefore, the combination does not render obvious claim 13 and associated dependent claims 14-18.

Claims 19-25

As discussed, neither Brown nor Watts teaches or suggests that an overlay memory stores a plurality of service programs associated with voice communication, fax communication, modem communication, video communication, and audio communication, as recited in amended claim 19. Therefore, the combination does not render obvious claim 19 and associated dependent claims 20-25.

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the arguments and amendments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome.

If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Lester J. Vincent at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: Jun 22, 2006

Lester J. Vincent
Registration No. 31,460

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300